

**REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS**

The following remarks and arguments are respectfully given:

The applicant has thoroughly reviewed the objections and remarks from the Examiner given in paragraphs 1 – 9.

All claims not listed as conditionally acceptable have been amended carefully and except for four deleted claims they are believed to now be in improved condition to meet the objections of the Examiner. There are four new dependent claims to replace the deleted claims and the applicant has thoroughly examined the description to verify the basis for these claims.

Claims listed as conditionally acceptable have been left unchanged or with minor amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended. It is considered that claim 1 now avoids being unclear and defines the invention by the actions separating the invention from prior art. It is also believed that the amended claim 1 serves to improve dependent claims as to not being unclear.

The applicant believes that the amendments to claim 1 improve the claim fundamentally and clearly distinguishes the invention from cited references and prior art and that further comments to cited references should not be necessary.

The applicant may add, however that one of the most distinguishing features of the invention is the application on medium that do not allow physical interruption as with power grids and even metal or plastic pipe systems. This is thoroughly taught in the description and regrettably was insufficiently incorporated in claim 1 in previous amendments.

It is clear that for instance Nazarathy et al could not have anticipated the application of two way cascaded gain blocks usage in such context. Besides, Nazarathy et al clearly teaches a focus on novel solutions to the well known synchronization challenges with return transmissions in Docsis and similar standards.

The attached document containing an amended description is without the references to claims in the beginnings of chapters Introduction and The Invention.

Further, one documents showing in detail amendments carried out for advisory purposes, is attached.

Reply to office action of January 20 2010

Docket: CU-3831

Having stated that each remark and objection in the Office Action paragraphs 1-9 was thoroughly observed throughout the amendments of the claims, this amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 20 June 2010

Geir Monsen Vavik  
Applicant